

Bailey, Heather

From: Nicholas Davies <nbdavies@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 17, 2024 1:12 PM
To: PLLCApplications
Subject: Great design guide, but needs more permissive solar guidance

Categories: Heather

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Landmarks Commission,

I appreciate all the work that has gone into the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts. This visual reference will go a long way towards streamlining the process for homeowners and for you all.

One thing that stuck out was the guidance about solar panels:

- 1. Roof-mounted solar arrays on sloped roofs shall be flat, parallel to the slope of the roof, and arranged in a pattern or grid parallel to the roof's ridge and eaves.*
- 2. Roof-mounted solar arrays on flat roofs shall be installed so as to be minimally visible from the developed public right-of-way.*

In this time of climate crisis, and very slow institutional adaptation to it, it's crucial that we not get in the way of individuals making a significant and long-term investment in sustainable energy.

The orientation and angle of a solar array is very important for its ability to perform effectively and productively. In addition, the location of tree canopy can determine which part of a roof can or cannot be usable for solar, and we should be careful not to incentivize destruction of tree canopy.

Meanwhile, an existing house's roof angle and its orientation to the street frontage are very difficult to modify, particularly while also juggling Historic District considerations. In other words, a given house's roof is where it is. Put these things together, and these guidelines could be prohibitive to the installation of solar on a particular houses.

The design guide is not entirely written in this absolutist ("shall") language. There are lots of guidelines that include options ("may"), such as for modern, energy-efficient lighting fixtures. I urge you to permit the installation of solar wherever it's most effective for generating electricity, and include the guidance on its placement as a recommendation.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St

Bailey, Heather

From: Linda <lehnertz.l@att.net>
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2024 12:14 PM
To: PLLCApplications
Cc: Rummel, Marsha
Subject: Comments re Legistar 82440, Illustrated Design Guidelines

Categories: Heather

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

I have not had time to review the 96-page Illustrated Design Guidelines in any detail, since the Guidelines were not added to the Legistar record until last Thursday. My understanding, gained from participating in the historic district rewrite process, was that these Guidelines would help residents understand how to meet the standards. Some parts do that, many others do not.

I did skip around the document and have a few preliminary comments.

- Page 8, Figure 14, says the masonry can be cleaned without a COA. Many people could see that and think they can proceed. It would be better to say it can be cleaned with the Preservation Planner's approval.
- Page 28 talks of siding needing to be toothed in. This is certainly a place where an illustration would help people understand the meaning, but there is none.
- Page 29, Figure 56 purports to show a compatible metal railing. But the porch railing consists of solid panels. It is highly unlikely the original step railing was metal. So if a prior owner replaced a wood railing with a metal one in the 1970's, can that owner again use a metal railing?
- Page 31, Figure 60, is labeled, in part, as a prohibited electric vent because it is visible from the public right-of-way. Where are vents to be placed when the gabled end of a home faces the public street? All of the roof is visible from the public street.
- Page 53, Figure 107, shows a garage door that is said to be compatible with the house, but no explanation is provided. What qualities make this door compatible? And what does an incompatible door look like? (Also this home is not in a historic district.)
- Page 53 has text about compatible entrance doors, but no photos are shown to illustrate compatible and incompatible entrance doors.
- Page 54 has a nice illustration that shows 4 examples of under-the-porch enclosures. But the photo, Figure 110, of a house with good lattice also has a wrought iron railing deemed incompatible in Figure 73. Certainly a photo can be found of lattice where there is not a glaring incompatibility.
- Page 55, Figures 114 shows an incompatible balcony. It looks like this may be the required second exit for fire escape purposes. Would that change the assessment that this balcony is incompatible?
- Page 60, Figure 124 states the building has very different massing and building form. There is not a circle with an "X" on it –should there be?
- Page 67 has 3 figures addressing balconies. This is a section on new structures, but what is shown are balconies on old homes. Many pages addressing new structures show old buildings. This does not help anyone to understand what is allowed on new structures. For example, 906 Willy has a garage exhaust vent visible from the street. Would that need to be screened? It also has ugly white PVC venting popping out of the green panels. Is that okay, or would it, at a minimum, need to be painted?

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Lehnertz